UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,964	09/12/2003	Vijay V. Sarashetti	200600636-1	1087

22879 7590 03/01/2010

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
3404 E. Harmony Road
Mail Stop 35
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528

EXAMINER	
VO, TRUONG V	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2156	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/01/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
laura.m.clark@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/662,964	SARASHETTI, VIJAY V.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TRUONG V. VO	2156	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 January 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09/12/2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to communications filed January 11, 2010.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Status of Claims

3. Claims 1 to 38 are pending, of which claims 1, 9, 17, 21 and 24 are in independent form. Claims 1, 17 and 21 are objected to. Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Objection

4. Claims 1, 17 and 21 are objected to because of the following reasons: Claims 17 and 21 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 1. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k). Any claims not specifically addressed above, is being objected as incorporating the deficiencies of a claim upon which it depends.

5. Applicant is advised that should claim 1 be found allowable, claims 17 and 21 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ang et al. (US 2003/0030656 A1) in view of Gibson (US 2004/0030607 A1).

8. **Regarding claim 1**, Ang teaches a computer implemented method for representing records, the method comprising: assigning a unique identifier to the record stored at the record collection site (i.e., each of the pointers used as such includes either the unique identifiers or the sequential indices, as discussed above, that are used with each record depending on the portable computing platform onto which the portable computer database is to be placed; [0049]).

Ang teaches entering the unique identifier in a hierarchical tree structure stored in a computer readable storage medium at the record collection site, wherein the unique identifier comprises information for accessing the record in the memory location, and wherein the tree structure comprises a plurality of branches connected by nodes (i.e., the text builder program reads records from the portable database file and creates a hierarchy for the data therein, in BCEML, using an algorithm to arrange the hierarchy into a conventional genealogical structure. To display a particular target record, each target record is displayed in a genealogical tree with its eldest ancestor record, parent records connecting the target record to the ancestor, sibling records, and all children of the target record. The text builder, or " hierarchy builder", produces the desired output using tags derived from the customized BCEML markup language, to create objects such as hyperlinks, bolded text, and the styled formatting to be viewed on the display of the portable computing device. For each record in the portable computer database file, the text builder builds the hierarchy by assigning a "parent" pointer and a "child" pointer to each record. Each record may then be easily linked to either its parent in the hierarchical tree, or to its child. The parent pointer is null for those records at the top, or highest level, of the hierarchy tree. Furthermore, once a child link is tapped, the child pointer in each record allows the program to retrieve all records linked below the record as "children" of such a record. Furthermore, each of the pointers used as such includes either the unique identifiers or the sequential indices, as discussed above, that are used with each record depending on the portable computing platform onto which the portable

computer database is to be placed. This forms the hierarchical linkages in all the records; [0049]).

Ang teaches sending the hierarchical tree structure to a central storage site that is separate from the record collection site (i.e., see FIG. 1, one or more central databases 105 are connected to the communications network 101. Each database 105 is equipped with a database management system (DBMS). The DBMS may take any form such as relational, flat, network or hierarchical, and may support different query languages, including semi-standardized query languages such as structured query language (SQL), as well as more sophisticated fourth-generation languages for managing database systems; [0029]).

Ang teaches receiving requests from the central storage site to access records at the record collection site in accordance with the hierarchical tree structure sent to the central storage site (i.e., although server 110, central database 105, conversion processor 115 are shown as three separate devices in FIG. 1, it is contemplated that these devices can be implemented as three or fewer devices. As is more specifically described below, data in the central database 105 is processed and converted by the conversion processor 115 and placed onto the network server 110. A user connected to the network 101 may then obtain the processed data for use in the portable computing device 120; [0034]… a map is built between the unique identifier on the central relational database and the sequential index used in the portable computing database. For each record, the map constitutes a one to one relationship for each of the unique identifiers on the central relational database and its corresponding index in the portable

computer database. Each of the foregoing conversions from unique identifiers to sequential indices is executed for each record in the data derived from the central relational database; [0047]-[0049]… in step S565, the end-user may transfer the files to portable computing device 120 for rendering and viewing thereon in accordance with the system and method described herein; [0058]).

However, Ang does not explicitly disclose receiving an order for a transaction at a record collection site.

Meanwhile, Gibson discloses record keeping; [0041]. This is similar to Ang teaching because of the record keeping aspect. Furthermore, Gibson discloses receiving an order for a transaction at a record collection site (i.e., receiving the TRN and order data from the merchants site the transaction processing system generates an internal transaction record reference (TRR); [0047]).

Gibson teaches producing a record that represents the transaction at the record collection site; storing the record in a memory location in a computer readable storage medium at the record collection site (i.e., the TRN and uniquely identifies the order within the transaction processing system, and returns it to the merchants site for storage in the order pending file for future reference against the order, step 120. The TRR is stored together with the TRN and order data of this transaction in Step 122; [0047]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made, having the teachings of Ang and Gibson before him/her, to modify the method of Ang with the teaching of Gibson to improves record keeping. The motivation to combine is apparent in Ang's reference, because it is highly desirable to

provide a system and method for organizing, storing, and allowing users to retrieve information efficiently; (see Ang, [0013]). Therefore, it would be advantageous to implement the record keeping aspect of Ang with Gibson transaction system in order to efficiently provide a record proof for the transaction; (see Gibson, [0077]).

9. **Regarding claim 2**, Ang teaches using the unique identifier to produce an aggregate report of records collected by the record collection site (i.e., for each record, the map constitutes a one to one relationship for each of the unique identifiers on the central relational database and its corresponding index in the portable computer database; [0047]).

Ang teaches sending the aggregate report to the central storage site (i.e., see FIG. 1, #120 sending to #105).

10. **Regarding claim 3**, Ang teaches using the unique identifier at the central storage site to access the record stored at the record collection site (i.e., a map is built between the unique identifier on the central relational database and the sequential index used in the portable computing database; [0047]).

11. **Regarding claim 4**, Ang teaches wherein the unique identifier includes information representing a node located in the hierarchical tree structure (i.e., for each record in the portable computer database file, the text builder builds the hierarchy by assigning a "parent" pointer and a "child" pointer to each record. Each record may then

be easily linked to either its parent in the hierarchical tree, or to its child. The parent pointer is null for those records at the top, or highest level, of the hierarchy tree. Furthermore, once a child link is tapped, the child pointer in each record allows the program to retrieve all records linked below the record as "children" of such a record. Furthermore, each of the pointers used as such includes either the unique identifiers or the sequential indices, as discussed above, that are used with each record depending on the portable computing platform onto which the portable computer database is to be placed. This forms the hierarchical linkages in all the records; [0049]).

12. **Regarding claim 5**, Ang teaches wherein the node is located in a higher position of the hierarchical tree structure than the unique identifier (i.e., a "parent" pointer and a "child" pointer to each record. Each record may then be easily linked to either its parent in the hierarchical tree, or to its child. The parent pointer is null for those records at the top, or highest level, of the hierarchy tree; [0049]).

13. **Regarding claim 6**, Ang teaches wherein using the unique identifier to produce the aggregate report includes counting the unique identifier with a second unique identifier assigned to a second record stored at the record collection site (i.e., see FIG. 8A-FIG. 8E).

14. **Regarding claim 7**, Ang teaches wherein using the unique identifier to produce an aggregate report includes summing data included in the record accessed by the

unique identifier with data included in a second record accessed by a second unique identifier (i.e., the user may expand the size of second window 820, to reveal more of such field data, as illustrated in FIG. 8E; [0066]).

15. **Regarding claim 8**, Ang teaches wherein a unique key that includes information representing a second node in the hierarchical tree structure is assigned to the node (i.e., as shown in FIG. 8A-FIG. 8E a unique key can be interpreted as the unique name #832).

16. **Regarding claim 9**, is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

17. **Regarding claim 10**, is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

18. **Regarding claim 11**, is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

19. **Regarding claim 12**, is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

20. **Regarding claim 13**, is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

21. **Regarding claim 14**, is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

22. **Regarding claim 15**, is essentially the same as claim 7 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

23. **Regarding claim 16**, is essentially the same as claim 8 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

24. **Regarding claim 17**, is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a receiving method rather than a sending method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

25. **Regarding claim 18**, is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a receiving method rather than a sending method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

26. **Regarding claim 19**, is essentially the same as claims 2 and 3 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a receiving method rather than a sending method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

27. **Regarding claim 20**, is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a receiving method rather than a sending method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

28. **Regarding claim 21**, is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a using method rather than a sending method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

29. **Regarding claim 22**, is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a using method rather than a sending method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

30. **Regarding claim 23**, is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a using method rather than a sending method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

31. **Regarding claim 24**, is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

32. **Regarding claim 25**, is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

33. **Regarding claim 26**, is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

34. **Regarding claim 27**, Ang discloses wherein assigning a unique identifier to a record stored at a record collection site comprises: producing a record at the record collection site (i.e., see FIG. 7-FIG. 8).

Ang discloses producing a unique identifier for the record to allow the record to be identified, distinguished and accessed from the record collection site (i.e., a map is built between the unique identifier on the central relational database and the sequential index used in the portable computing database. For each record, the map constitutes a one to one relationship for each of the unique identifiers on the central relational database and its corresponding index in the portable computer database. Each of the foregoing conversions from unique identifiers to sequential indices is executed for each record in the data derived from the central relational database; [0047]).

Ang discloses assigning a unique identifier to the record so that the record is distinguishable from other records produced at the record collection site (i.e., see FIG. 7-FIG. 8).

Ang discloses entering the unique identifier assigned to the record into a tree structure which is also stored at the record collection site (i.e., see FIG. 1 and FIG. 7-FIG. 8).

35. **Regarding claim 28**, most of the limitations of this claim have been met in the rejection of claim 27 above. Ang further discloses tree structure identifiers are assigned to similar record types and are grouped together thereby improving accessibility for the stored records (i.e., see FIG. 7-FIG. 8).

36. **Regarding claim 29**, most of the limitations of this claim have been met in the rejection of claim 28 above. Ang further discloses the tree structure is produced with a database software package capable of storing data in a balanced tree structure (i.e., see FIG. 7-FIG. 8 and for each record, the map constitutes a one to one relationship for each of the unique identifiers on the central relational database and its corresponding index in the portable computer database. Each of the foregoing conversions from unique identifiers to sequential indices is executed for each record in the data derived from the central relational database; [0047]).

37. **Regarding claim 30**, is essentially the same as claim 27 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

38. **Regarding claim 31**, is essentially the same as claim 28 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

39. **Regarding claim 32**, is essentially the same as claim 29 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a computer program product rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

40. **Regarding claim 33**, is essentially the same as claim 27 and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

41. **Regarding claim 34**, is essentially the same as claim 28 and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

42. **Regarding claim 35**, is essentially the same as claim 29 and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

43. **Regarding claim 36**, is essentially the same as claim 27 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

44. **Regarding claim 37**, is essentially the same as claim 28 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

45. **Regarding claim 38**, is essentially the same as claim 29 except that it sets forth the claimed invention as a system rather than a method and rejected for the same reasons as applied hereinabove.

Conclusion

46. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

47. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Truong V. Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1796. The Examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thr. 7:30a.m.-5p.m..

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Pierre Vital can be reached on (571) 272-4215. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

February 8, 2010

Truong Van Vo

/Truong V Vo/
Examiner, Art Unit 2156

/Pierre M. Vital/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2156